

This is not all a requirement for filing an application. The examiner cannot arbitrarily make his or her own rules. If the examiner insists on these requirements, he or she should show the legal authority for these requirements.

2. Applicant's claim for priority on a previously filed provisional is fully acknowledged and fully expects the examiner to check whether a proper support is present.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drawings fail to include the conventional names, as described in the specification, e.g. batteries, etc. for the elements 12, 16, 18 etc. shown in Figs. 1 - 4 with non-conventional symbols. There is no set rule how the inventor can or should describe his or her invention by way of written words in the drawings or by way of reference characters, as applicant did, but the examiner cannot dictate which way is best to describe the invention. The examiner wants to see a proposed drawing correction which will not be held in abeyance, meaning, the case will go abandoned. The applicant is entitled to illustrate the invention in any way suitable. In this application, the applicant chose to use reference characters to illustrate and describe the invention. The examiner must withdraw the holding in this paragraph.

4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the reference character "44" has been used to designate both a reverse osmosis filter system (page 6 ) and a reverse osmosis filter system (page 8). The applicant does not understand the above noted problem. The specification will be amended to show that the reference character 44 in Fig. 2 involves a reverse osmosis "system" and not just a filter.

5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because the drawings must show every feature of the invention as specified. The desalination system will be canceled from the claims.

6. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all minor errors.

6 a) The applicant is not sure why "automobile batteries" is not correct. If the examiner insists of an incorrectness, he or she has to be more specific.

6 (b) on page 8 of the specification will be corrected.

7. The applicant believes that the title of the invention is correct.

"Renewable stored energy power generating apparatus"

is what the invention is all about. It has been made amply clear in the specification that the stored energy is in the form of batteries and is ready to be used at any time to deliver power to the water filtration system. However, when the stored energy is all used up or depleted, it will be restored by a solar power unit supplying power to the energy in the batteries. Therefore, the title states that energy stored in the batteries can be renewed by a power generating apparatus, that is, the solar panel system.

8. Citation of the statute of 35 U.S.C. 112.

9. Claims 1 -18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second Par.

The examiner chose a form paragraph that has nothing to do what is claimed in claim 1, for example. The examiner states that the claims are narrative in form and are replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The applicant totally disagrees with this type of rejection.

Claim 1 clearly recites a renewable stored energy generating apparatus comprising a fully contained and stand alone container, What is wrong with this language?, said container containing one or more storage batteries for providing auxiliary power when required, This is a positive recitation and is not narrative at all, one or more renewable energy sources connected to said storage batteries, this is not a narrative recitation, a water filtration system being connected to an inlet of a pump, This is a positive recitation and there is no problem with proper antecedents, Means for operating said pump by said storage batteries,

This surely is a proper recitation, an outlet of said pump is connected to an inlet of a water filter, This certainly is a positive recitation and is nowhere in the narrative, said water filter includes an outlet that is connected to a water dispensing device, where is the narrative form? said apparatus is ready for operation except for a deployment of said renewable energy source.

The examiner continuous to state that "the structure which goes to make up the apparatus must be clearly and positively specified". The examiner does not state why this has not been done. Why is claim 1 not in a one sentence only? Please identify. Please do not throw "Form Paragraphs" into an action and a rejection.

The applicant fully believes that the limitations recited in the preamble fully and clearly give meaning to the claims. The examiner gives an example:

9a. The statement **"said apparatus is ready for operation except for a deployment of said renewable energy"** contradicts a previous statement, i.e., **"storage batteries for providing auxiliary power when required"**. First of all this is not an example of any limitations in the preamble of the claim as was stated above. The examiner states that "the applicant needs to distinguish whether the solar panels provide continuous power or not. From the specification and the claims it is clear that the self-contained apparatus as shown in Fig. 3 is ready on a standby basis or is ready for operation (as is expressed in the claims). In case of a power failure, all that is required is to deploy the power available, that is, the solar panels or the batteries, meaning, the stored energy. It is believed that the applicant does not "need to distinguish whether the solar panels provide continuous power or not". Again, the specification makes it clear that when there is an emergency, such as a general power failure, the solar panels on the standby container can be deployed (Fig. 3) or on top of a roof to provide continuous power until the emergency has abated. On the other hand, on a cloudy day, the solar panels provide diminished power and therefore, the storage batteries provide the power for the filter system. As

is well known, batteries provide power only for a certain length of time until they need recharging or "renewed" energy supplied thereto. The solar panels, when operating, are renewing the energy to the batteries which contain the stored energy.

9b) The statement "a fresh water or salt water filter" has been corrected in the corrected claims.

9c) The examiner has a problem with the phrase "a renewable stored energy generating apparatus" stating "that it is not clear why it comprises a water filtration system, a pump, a filter, etc. The applicant claims "a renewable stored energy generating apparatus as a prelude what else is claimed in claimed 1 which will provide the power for a water filtration system. The examiner should not take individual phrases out of a claim without considering the totality of what else is claimed to make up the whole structure of the claim.

The applicant will amend claim 1 on a separate sheet to indicate that the main thrust of the invention is directed to a portable reverse osmosis water filtration system that includes a renewable energy generating apparatus.

Also continuing under paragraph 9c) of the examiner's action, claims 3 - 7: the functional recitations "for storing", "for receiving", "for connecting" and "for converting" have not been given any patentable weight because they are narrative in form. Patentable weight should be handled under an art rejection such as under 103. The examiner's attention is directed to 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph which states that an element in may be expressed as a means or a step for performing a specific structure etc.. This is exactly what the applicant did and the examiner cannot now state that these recitations are in a "narrative form"

The examiner has a problem with claim 10 with the "statement of a water filtration apparatus that is self-contained within a stand-alone container" lacking antecedents in the specification, and is confusing since Fig. 1 describes a container having batteries therein. It is clear from the specification that the water filtration